DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 606 JC 870 258

AUTHOR Pedersen, Robert
TITLE The Forest Park Junior College Center: Maryland's First Public Junior College.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; College Faculty; Curriculum Problems; *Educational History; Financial Problems; *Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Survival; *School Closing; School Support; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *Forest Park Junior College Center MD

ABSTRACT

An overview is provided of the 29-month (February 1934 to June 1936) history of Maryland's first public junior college, the Forest Park Junior College Center (FPJCC). First, the paper describes two previous attempts to establish a public junior college in Maryland, explaining how mayoral opposition blocked both efforts. The next section of the paper looks at the establishment of the FPJCC, pointing out that the self-interest of Johns Hopkins University (JHU) graduate students and the involvement of Martin Hihn, the Baltimore school district's Director of Adult Education, led to the center's opening and initial success, but also diminished its subsequent prospects. The enthusiastic reception given to the FPJCC is highlighted next, focusing on the unanticipated administrative problems caused by the unexpectedly large size of the center's charter class and the factors which made the large opening enrollment all but certain. The next sections profile the FPJCC faculty, which was made up of former faculty, doctoral candidates, and recent graduates from JHU; explain the influences on the center's curriculum, which favored the study of language, history, sciences, and mathematics; consider the administrative structure and governance model of the center; and describe the FPJCC's extracurricular activities. Finally, the paper explains forces leading to the closing of the center, including bureaucratic indecision and red tape, funding uncertainties, and curriculum problems. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. PEDERSEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED282606

The Forest Park Junior College Center: Maryland's First Public Junior College

Robert Pedersen
Dean
Curriculum and
Instructional Development
El Camino College
Torrence, CA 90506

JC 870 258

THE FOREST PARK JUNIOR COLLEGE CENTER

MARYLAND'S FIRST PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE

The Issue

In recent years, a small controversy has developed over the question of which college may rightfully claim to be Maryland's first public junior college. At the heart of this debate have been the conflicting claims of precedence made on behalf of Montgomery College and Hagerstown Junior College. According to W. L. Fox, Montgomery College deserves this honor, as it was the first public junior college authorized by a county board of education.[1] Stanley G. Alford, however, has argued that Hagerstown "ought get the victor's palm" since it was the first junior college to actually begin instruction.[2]

Montgomery and Hagerstown may well be Maryland's two oldest public junior colleges in continuous operation. Neither, however, can claim to be the state's first. From February, 1934 to June, 1936, the Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners operated the federally-funded Forest Park Junior College Center (FPJCC). In all important respects, this center was a true junior college. Each semester, the FPJCC provided approximately 500 students with a sound liberal arts program and a full extra-curriculum. The FPJCC was closely supervised by a well regarded Baltimore City school administrator, instruction was in the hands of an impressively credentialed faculty, and there was even hope of regional accreditation. Yet like a great many of the early junior colleges, the Forest Park Center was seed cast upon rocky soil, and its early closure was virtually assured by the circumstances

of its birth. Nevertheless, for more than two years, the FPJCC afforded many young Baltimoreans their first opportunity for higher education, and this effort, whatever its final result, should not go unrecognized.

Historical Precedence

Even before 1934, as Fields has documented, several attempts had been made to establish a public junior college in Baltimore.[3] However, these efforts went for naught in the face of strong mayoral opposition. The possibility of establishing a junior college was first raised in 1927, but was quickly opposed by Mayor Broening. According to reports in the Baltimore Sun, the mayor not only believed the cost of such a college, estimated at $100,000 per year, to be excessive, he also felt that a junior college would only benefit the children of the well-to-do.

A second and more serious attempt to open a junior college would be made in 1929. In that year, Councilman Albrecht proposed the addition of $125,000 to the budget of the Board of School Commissioners to provide for a junior college department as part of Baltimore's City College High School. From reports in the Sun, it would appear that Councilman Albrecht's motives in this proposal were largely personal. His son, it seems, had experienced some difficulty in securing the two years of collegiate instruction then required for admission to the University of Maryland's law school. Not only was Baltimore without a public undergraduate college, but the Johns Hopkins University, the city's one prestigious institution, seemed intent upon discontinuing the first two years of its undergraduate program. While Albrecht's

proposal gained the support of David E. Weglein, Baltimore's powerful superintendent of public schools, both Council President Bryant and Mayor Jackson opposed the expenditure. As had Mayor Jackson before, both politicians argued that a junior college department would only benefit the "preferred few." And just as in 1927, mayoral opposition would prove decisive in forestalling establishment of a public junior college in the city of Baltimore.

Quite ironically, it was only with the Depression that Baltimore's public schools gained the opportunity and means to establish a junior college. Like many other local school districts, Baltimore found a ready source of funding for a junior college in Henry Hopkin's Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA). FERA officials, in their haste to expend a Congressional appropriation of $500 million, proved more than willing to support a variety of social experiments --- ranging from nursery schools to literacy centers and even junior colleges --- so long as these experiments created jobs.[4] Despite some Congressional opposition to "white collar welfare" and without explicit legislative authority, FERA not only underwrote the cost of the FPJCC in Baltimore, but junior colleges in New York, Michigan, Ohio and New Jersey as well. While nearly all of these colleges eventually succumbed to federal budget cuts, a few of the FERA colleges survived and even prospered.[5]

Establishing the Center

It is unfortunate that much of the Baltimore school system's own internal memoranda and other records from the Depression era has been lost. Little documentary evidence remains to either illuminate

the events immediately surrounding the FPJCC's opening or to indicate to what extent, if any, the center represented a sincere attempt by the school district to establish a permanent junior college. According to one early staff report, the idea of a junior college center originated within a graduate seminar at the Johns Hopkins University.[6] While these graduate students may have been influenced by other considerations, it is most likely that they suggested the need for the center out of a self-interested desire to create teaching posts for themselves and other Hopkins students. How this idea came to be adopted by the Baltimore school district is unclear. What is known is that administrative responsibility for opening the center was assigned to Martin Hihn, the school system's Director of Adult Education and that Hihn moved quickly to give the idea form. FERA funds which had been earmarked for a series of vocational classes were reallocated to open the center, and a Hopkins graduate student, Ruth Barnes, was appointed the center's first director.

The self-interest of Hopkins graduate students and the involvement of Martin Hihn ensured the center's opening and initial success. Yet it was these very conditions, important as they were to the center's founding, which diminished its subsequent prospects. Over the course of its brief history, the FPJCC failed to develop into something beyond a "white collar" public works program and, as a result, was never seen as serving the interests of either the Baltimore school bureaucracy or of influential political and civic groups. A major factor in this failure was certainly Martin Hihn. Nothing in Martin Hihn's career had prepared him to exercise the kind of leadership required to transform

an experiment into a permanent foundation. Originally a truant officer, Hihn rose through the administrative ranks until, by 1933, he headed up the school system's adult program, where his primary concern was the introduction of recent immigrants to the rudiments of English and the principles of good citizenship. As long as federal funds were available to underwrite its costs, Hihn supported the FPJCC. However, when federal support was withdrawn in 1936, Hihn raised no arguments in defense of the center, but instead recommended its closing to the Baltimore School Commissioners.

The limits of Hihn's vision, and especially his failure to grasp the larger potential of the FPJCC, are evident in his description of the center and its purposes. In defining the purposes of the center, Hihn stayed close to the intent of FERA legislation. The center's first and primary goal, according to Hihn, was to provide "idle educators" with faculty positions during a time of increasing unemployment. It is now difficult to determine the full extent of such unemployment among Baltimoreans qualified to teach at the collegiate level, for degree holders were reticent to apply for relief. However, teaching positions for new graduates and doctoral degree candidates were certainly few. And, despite meager pay and uncertain job security, positions at the center were always fully subscribed.

A secondary goal of the center was to provide recent high school graduates, particularly the unemployed, with an opportunity to further their education at little or no cost. From the start, it was intended that the center would draw its students from among those who could neither afford the cost nor enjoyed the leisure time required by

Baltimore's private colleges. Martin Hihn certainly realized that even the nominal tuition of Baltimore's private colleges was a barrier for the poor in a city especially hard-hit by the Depression. And, for those students fortunate enough to have jobs, enrollment in a traditional day program was simply out of the question. Yet Hihn's objective was not the democritization of higher education. Rather, by drawing off recent high school graduates into a junior college program, the center was also expected to reduce the number of young people competing for scarce jobs. As Hihn himself wrote, "the FPJCC... keeps youth in school and busy during these trying times of unemployment, thus lessening the danger of the older man being supplanted in his work by the younger who may not be as needy."[7]

That Weglein and others within the school system may not have seen the center evolving into a permanent junior college is suggested by the system's reticence to support the center from local resources. Apart from Hihn's own involvement, the school system's commitment to the center remained quite minimal. Like so many other public junior colleges of the time, the FPJCC was not assigned a facility of its own, but was relegated to the upper two floors of Forest Park High School. As one would expect, both the staff and students of the center quickly came to see themselves as intruders in a system concerned primarily with the education of the young. As Ruth Barnes reminded both staff and students early in their first semester, "we are guests in one of the best high schools in the city. May we be courteous ones, with a careful eye on the housekeeping and upon our own personal conduct."[8] Moreover, not only were the center's students expected to conform to

rules more appropriately imposed on adolescents, they were denied even the few amenities enjoyed by Forest Park High School's regular day students. Smoking was not permitted and the center's students were instructed to keep the corridors clear during class hours. And, while the high school had a fairly large library, it was not open to the junior college students. If these students wished to study, they could avail themselves of one of the empty classrooms on the building's fourth floor.

Student Response

Despite the school system's ambivalence toward the center, and however uncertain its continued federal support, the FPJCC was received with great enthusiasm by students. Martin Hihn and the center staff may very well have viewed the center as a source of interim employment or an educational experiment. Students, however, responded to the center as if it were destined to become a permanent fixture of Baltimore public education. Quite to Hihn's surprise, the FPJCC enrolled 546 students during its first week. Overnight, the center had become one of the country's largest junior colleges.

The unexpectedly large size of the center's charter class presented Hihn with a number of unanticipated administrative problems. As he observed, the "enrollment of 546 students created a vast amount of office details such as completing schedules, making assignments, completing the register, handling laboratory fees, etc." And, as if the sheer number of students was not problem enough, Hihn soon found that his efforts to resolve these difficulties placed him squarely at odds with FERA and its regulations.

To assist with registration and records management, Hihn employed Leavitt Dearborn as the center's first registrar. Dearborn, a recent Hopkins graduate, had been originally hired as an instructor, and his reassignment to an administrative position soon developed into something of a cause celebre. Sometime early in the center's first semester, an anonymous complainant wrote FERA officials in Washington, challenging Dearborn's reassignment. Not only, was it alleged, had Dearborn stopped teaching (even though it was on this basis that he was paid), but he was being supported by his aunt and therefore did not qualify for federal relief. While Hihn vigorously defended his decision to shift Dearborn to an administrative position, he was unable to refute the allegations. Under considerable pressure from FERA's Maryland state director, Dearborn agreed to resign his position at the center in March, 1934. While Dearborn's administrative duties were eventually reassigned to others, the entire incident made clear the center's vulnerability in the absence of local political support.

Although not recognized at the time, several factors had made the center's unexpectedly large opening enrollment all but certain. Two of these factors, which have already been noted, were the absence of tuition and the center's exclusively evening program. Students may also have been drawn to the college because it was co-educational, at a time when most of Baltimore's colleges and many of its high schools were still exclusively male or female. Finally, and possibly of greatest importance, the center was widely and effectively advertised. Ruth Barnes discussed the center and its program on a number of radio talk shows and circulated announcements of its opening among "public

libraries, various clubs, department stores, and places of business, churches and the Y's--Hebrew and Christian." For his part, Martin Hihn appealed directly to the city's high school principals for students. The center was unique in city of Baltimore, and through it access to higher education was extended to a sizeable and previously unserved population.

The FPJCC Faculty

Whatever their similarities, the FPJCC differed from other public junior colleges of the period in one important respect. Typically, early junior colleges drew their faculty and administrative staff from the high school faculty of the sponsoring system. FERA regulations, however, precluded the center from hiring a faculty in this manner. In staffing the center, Martin Hihn looked not to the public schools, but the Johns Hopkins University. Through the university, Hihn was able to secure a number of well qualified, albeit unemployed, former faculty, doctoral candidates and recent graduates to serve as the nucleus of his junior college faculty.

The faculty profile of the typical Depression-era junior college had changed little since studied by Koos in the mid-1920's.[9] The vast majority of junior college faculty held the master's degree, although an occasional Ph.D could be found. A significant percentage held only the baccalaureate, although these faculty members were generally instructors in vocational programs, and a small but significant percentage held no formal degrees at all. In so far as their credentials were concerned, at least, the center's faculty would likely have felt more at home at a major state university than at a junior college. Of the 31

teaching faculty listed in the center's 1934-35 catalogue, eleven held the doctorate from the Johns Hopkins, and eight the Master's degree. Of the thirteen faculty with only baccalaureate degrees, four had completed advanced study at such foreign universities as the Sorbonne, Berlin and Edinburgh, and all but two were pursuing doctoral degrees at the Johns Hopkins.

Curriculum

The appointment of what was, at least from the standpoint of credentials, a university faculty, would strongly color the center's curriculum. Specific responsibility for developing this curriculum fell to Minnie Knipp, herself a Hopkins doctoral candidate in mathematics. As revealed in a subsequent report on the center's first months of operation, Knipp brought to her assignment a strong anti-vocational bias and an equally strong commitment to the value of liberal culture. As Knipp wrote in March, 1934, "The College Center is being developed as a liberal college because...the college's chief function is the development of the mind."[10] By her own admission, Knipp's curricular work was informed by Alexander Meiklejohn's theories of education and liberal culture. During his tenure at Brown and later, as President of Amherst, Meiklejohn had argued forceably against utilitarian concepts of higher education, and in favor of a program which would broaden and deepen the student's insight into knowledge itself, free of any immediate or practical value.[11]

The curriculum fashioned by Minnie Knipp during January and February of 1934 gives every evidence of Meiklejohn's influence. The courses offered strongly favored the study of language, both ancient and

modern, history, the pure sciences and mathematics. A student could elect to study Latin through the sophomore level or even take a course on early medieval history. While sociology was tolerated, with one course being offered through the History Department, psychology was not. The center did agree to offer one non-credit psychology course during its first semester, but it was developed "to make the student conscious of the problems of human behavior in his life, rather than primarily to make him a professional psychologist."[12]

Other evidence, however, also suggests that Hihn and the center's faculty and staff were in no sense mere traditionalists. Apart from the curriculum itself, the center took a number of innovative steps in responding to the special circumstances of its students. The most striking example of such innovation can be found in the number of credit hours assigned to each course. Because the continuation of the center from one semester to the next was always in doubt, Hihn and Knipp felt it best "to leave the student with a full year's credit in each of two subjects rather than with a half year's credit in each of four subjects." Every course offered at the center met for a minimum of six hours per week and was designed to cover the material normally completed in two semesters of study at an established college. Thus, while the typical student at the center enrolled for only two courses, with each course meeting for three hours on either Monday and Wednesday or Tuesday and Thursday, he or she carried the equivalent of a full-time load.

A second innovation would come in the area of what is now commonly known as "developmental studies." The center was governed by what was,

for all intents and purposes, an open admissions policy. The sole requirement for admission as a regular student was a high school diploma, but even this nominal requirement could be waived. From the start, Minnie Knipp recognized that this liberal admissions policy would likely attract students incapable of doing collegiate work. In order to identify these students, Knipp required that everyone who enrolled in the center's Freshman Rhetoric course first take the Columbia Placement Test in English. Based on the results of this testing, approximately 50 of the center's first class were reassigned to Sub-Freshman Rhetoric. As described in the center's 1934-35 catalogue, Sub-Freshman Rhetoric was structured along lines quite similar to the remedial courses now so prevalent in community colleges. The course was to provide a "rigorous investigation of the principles and practice of grammar" while exploring "the elementary processes of punctuation, mechanics, and spelling..." As is characteristic of remedial coursework, Sub-Freshman Rhetoric was offered for no credit.

Governance

Where each element of the curriculum was carefully developed by Minnie Knipp in accord with Meiklejohn's concept of a liberal college, the administrative structure was influenced by divergent, often conflicting governance models. Like more established colleges, the center's teaching faculty was headed by a dean and subdivided along departmental lines. Yet there is no evidence that these departments enjoyed any degree of operational autonomy and the dean does not appear to have played even a minimal role in overall college governance. Indeed, in its day-to-day operation, the center was governed much like

a Baltimore high school. Nearly every facet of the FPJCC's operation was the responsibility of either Ruth Barnes or Minnie Knipp. As the center's director, Barnes appointed and scheduled faculty, collected any student's fees and prepared all FERA-mandated reports. Faculty who met FERA eligibility requirements were appointed by Ruth Barnes and could be dismissed summarily should their sections fail to attract sufficient enrollment. Minnie Knipp not only had general responsibility for the center's curriculum, but apparently supervised its instructors as well. While there is no indication that any faculty member was ever terminated for incompetence or other "cause," Knipp did develop and regularly administer a faculty evaluation instrument which could well have formed the basis for any such decision.

Extra-Curriculum

Just as the center's curriculum was imitative of the traditional liberal arts college, so was its extra-curriculum. Despite serious constraints of facilities and time, Hihn and his staff made a concerted effort to encourage a full extra-curriculum. Within two months of the center's opening, a student newspaper had begun regular publication, a student government had been organized and officers elected, and a weekly series of college-wide assemblies initiated. More than a diversion from serious academic pursuits, the center's extra-curriculum played a key role in acculturating students into "collegiate" values and norms. At the very heart of the FPJCC's extra-curriculum was the student newspaper, the Eccentric. First published in March, 1934, the Eccentric did much to create a sense of common purpose and experience among students. The newspaper's early issues focused almost

exclusively upon the center itself. Stories in the Eccentric's initial number were divided between those designed to explain the center to its new students and those which reminded them of the need to behave in a "proper" manner. From the issue's lead story, students learned of the center's origins and relationship to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, its departmental structure and the widespread hope that the center would continue in operation beyond one semester. Students were also informed of Dean Diehl's efforts to organize a student government which would help to foster an awareness among students of their "duty to see that there is no cause for complaint against (students) from any source" and of the need to "observe those regulations which have been laid down."

By the 1934-35 school year, the Eccentric had adopted a much broader definition of "college news." Articles in the paper's April, 1935, issue ranged from an interview with Dr. Blackwell, then Maryland's Assistant Director of Public Education, on the feasibility of a universal system of free, public higher education to a report on efforts to organize a Liberal Club at the college to "look into and discuss the facts of Communism, Fascism, Socialism, Democracy and kindred national set-ups, as well as problems of the home and job finding." This issue also informed students of a poll taken of male students at the University of Western Ontario which revealed a preference for brunettes, Columbia University's suspension of the Daily Spectator and the reforms of Huey Long. By this time, items about the personal lives of students and staff also had developed into a major feature of the paper. The decision of a center instructor, Dr. Frank

Liggett, to leave teaching and take up farming in Western Maryland was covered in some detail, as was the marriage of Armin Kellner and Catherine Tannenbaum, two students in the center's History of Economic Thought class, and Mr. Kellner's appointment to the rabbinate. At the same time, the Eccentric continued its earlier practice of reminding students of the need to deport themselves in a "collegiate" manner. In an editorial, the staff observed,

> Good manners are tacitly but universally conceded to be an inseparable adjunct to any college education. College manners are not an exclusive brand. College courtesy is not a matter of geography, nor is its use controlled by the relative eminence or non-eminence of the institution attended. Good breeding is in place anywhere.
> It has been the constant attempt of students and faculty to keep (the) College Center on the level of a good college.
> In such a college it is not customary to be forced to write editorials on manners. College students are presumed to be ladies and gentlemen with sufficient home training to conduct themselves with dignity and fit decorum. Those who are unfortunate enough not to have had this training soon learn to adapt themselves to the customs dictated by good breeding or remove themselves, unregretted, to those places they find preferable.

A second, and equally vital, facet of the FPJCC's extra-curriculm was its program of bi-weekly student assemblies. These assemblies, held every other Monday during the center's first semester, were intended to serve two general purposes. First, it was expected that the assemblies would keep students informed on matters of college-wide interest, a role which evidently paralleled that of the Eccentric. It was also intended that the assemblies, as "a regular feature of all college work," would be used to introduce the student body to the

critical issues of the day. Through such exposure, as Ruth Barnes observed, students might better "find their position in the twentieth century civilization as educated persons." Typical of the talks given at the center's regular assembly was Ruth Barnes' talk given in February, 1934, as reported in the Eccentric:

> At the assembly on Monday, February 26, Miss Barnes presented a talk on "Our Last Frontier," in which was drawn an analogy between the early pioneers of the West and those of the present day who are extending the frontiers of education. In this talk, Miss Barnes elaborated on four characteristics which she considers criteria of culture: emotional feeling, imagination, tolerance, and a sense of humor. Selections from modern American poets were read and enjoyed by those present. Miss Barnes kindly refrained from telling us that our backs were to the wall and it was up to us to make our own futures; but it would be as well for us to realize those facts and work now for what we hope to have in the future.

There is some indication that not all of the center's students reacted to these assemblies in a "collegiate" manner. As reported in the April 1935 issue of the Eccentric, Martin Hihn found it necessary to chide students at a March assembly for a general lack of seriousness in their response to a presentation by a fellow student. Interestingly, the Eccentric also reported that Hihn's remarks were greeted by "loud applause," which it interpreted as a rejection of the "frivolous minority" by the more serious, if less vocal, majority of students in attendance.

Closing of the Center

Despite the hopes of faculty and staff, and the enthusiasm with which it was initially received by students, the FPJCC was short-lived.

In all, the center was in operation for only five semesters, and the decision by the Board of School Commissioners to close down their experiment in higher education was unopposed. The failure of the center to fulfill its potential and become, as had been initially hoped, "a permanent part of the educational program of the City" can be largely attributed to two factors. Most obviously, the center was a victim of bureaucratic indecision and red tape. A college must be reasonably certain of its fiscal resources for coming semesters if it is to plan a coherent program of study. The center, dependent as it was upon FERA and, subsequently, WPA funds, lived uncomfortably with an uncertain future.

Even in its first semester, there was the distinct possibility that a shortage of federal funds would close the center before June. As early as April, 1934, the intervention of C. F. Klinefelter, an Assistant Director of FERA, was needed to arrange a transfer of funds through Maryland's FERA office to keep the center open.[13] Yet the most serious, and eventually fatal blow to the center, came with the absorption of FERA programs by the Works Projects Administration (WPA) in July, 1935. Under FERA regulations, potential faculty members had only to establish that they had been unemployed immediately prior to appointment to the center's faculty. To this, the WPA added the additional requirement that faculty appointees be on relief. As none of the center's faculty from the prior year had applied for welfare during the intervening summer, they were initially found to be ineligible for faculty positions during the 1935-36 academic year. At first, it appears that the WPA intended to hold firm to its new requirement,

effectively forcing the center to close. However, sufficient public support, led by Maryland's Senator Tydings, was forthcoming during September, 1935, that WPA officials agreed to reconsider their position.[14] Not until November, however, was the center authorized to re-hire its faculty, and this federal dispensation was granted for only the 1935-36 academic year. While the WPA's action in this matter did not directly close the center, it certainly did irreparable harm. Classes for the 1935-36 year did not begin until November, and enrollments naturally suffered. Total enrollment at the FPJCC fell below 400, and a number of faculty had to be terminated after all. Moreover, it was this decline in enrollment which was used by the Baltimore School Commissioners as their immediate justification for closing the center in June, 1936.

In retrospect, however, the FPJCC was even more a victim of its curriculum than the uncertainties of funding. In building a curriculum which would facilitate student transfer to established colleges and universities, the center lost any possibility of direct city support of its program. In the 1920's, Baltimore's mayors had made clear their view of junior colleges as "elitest" ventures, and the difficult fiscal situation in which the City found itself during the Depression made an expenditure on a college opposed to utilitarian values politically indefensible. When WPA regulations became burdensome, Hihn could not turn to the City for support and he was left with no choice but to support the center's closing. The final irony would be, however, that despite the efforts of Knipp and Hihn, none of Baltimore's local colleges or universities ever agreed to recognize the center's credits,

and there is no evidence that any student actually transferred from the FPJCC to Goucher College, the Johns Hopkins University or the University of Maryland.

The Larger Context

The emergence of the public junior college is typically portrayed in relatively simple terms. The junior college was born of local initiative and reflected the desire of local communities to democritize access to higher education. The junior college carried forward the expansion of opportunity which began with the grafting of high school to common school and, like the high school, was destined to evolve into a universally accepted feature of American education.[15]

If nothing else, the history of the ill-fated FPJCC calls into question many of the assumptions about the evolution of the early public junior college. Not only is it misleading to overlook the significant contribution of state and federal governments in establishing junior colleges, it is inaccurate to presuppose local support for the expansion of educational opportunity represented by the junior college. A more complete and accurate history of the junior college must acknowledge that the impetus to establish individual colleges originated from a variety of sources, not all local. Just as the FPJCC and Union College owed their founding to federal sponsorship, so were junior colleges established through the direct action of state universities or state legislatures. Similarly, the fate of a junior college, once established, was far from certain. A surprisingly large proportion of the early junior colleges eventually closed, many within the first few years of operation and regardless of their sponsorship.

What appears to distinguish the failed junior college from those which endured was not so much its sponsorship as the ability of its campus administrators to make civic and school leadership see the college as serving vital community interests. In this respect, the FPJCC was typical of the failed junior college. Under Hihn's direction, the FPJCC never developed beyond a federal jobs program for unemployed faculty and, as such, could not command the support of either school or civic leaders once federal funds were withdrawn. While the specific circumstances might vary, a similar failure of leadership led to the closure of a number of other public junior colleges, among them Crane Junior College in Chicago and Pipestone Junior College in Minnesota. At least before 1950, it must be recognized that the public junior college had not established a presumptive claim on public support and, to be complete, any history of the early public junior college must address the effectiveness of individual colleges in establishing and maintaining essential support among key elements of civic and school leadership.

Notes

1. William Lloyd Fox, Montgomery College, Maryland's First Community College, 1946-1970, (Rockville, MD: Montgomery College), p. 11.

2. Stanley G. Alford, "The Historical Development of Hagerstown Junior College" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1976), p. 12. Other arguments have also been made in support of St. Mary's Seminary in southern Maryland and two small junior colleges established in 1935 as part of Salisbury and Frostburg State Teachers Colleges.

3. Ralf Rodney Fields, "A Case Study of Major Educational Changes in a Two-Year College: The Democratization of Baltimore Junior College, 1947-1970" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971), pp 78-82.

4. William E. Leuchtenburg, Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal (New York:Harper & Row, 1963), pp 121-123.

5. One survivor is Union College of New Jersey. Its early history is recalled in Trish MacKay and Roy Smith, "50 Winds Over Union County", AACJC Journal, LXIV, no. 7 (April, 1984), pp 50-51.

6. Minnie Knipp, "College Center, Baltimore's Junior College", March, 1934,(Memeographed.)

7. Forest Park College Center Catalogue 1934-35, p. 3,(Mimeographed.)

8. "Bulletin #2", Forest Park College Center, November 5, 1934.

9. Leonard Koos, The Junior College (Minneapolis:The University of Minnesota, 1924), pp 189-201.

10. Knipp, p. 2

11. Alexander Meiklejohn, Freedom and the College (New York:The Century Company, 1923), pp 155-189.

12. Catalogue, p. 17

13. Letter from C.F. Klinefelter to J.D. Blackwell, April 18, 1934.

14. Letter from Millard Tydings to Harry L. Hopkins, September 20, 1935.

15. James W. Thorton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York:Harper & Row, 1972), pp 46-52. Thorton, like most others, does give Harper and other university presidents credit for originating the idea of a junior college, but sees the universities playing no significant role in actually establishing individual junior colleges.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 10 1987